arXiv:1607.04431v1 [cs.DM] 15 Jul 2016

Edge-Orders

Lena Schlipf
LG Theoretische Informatik
FernUniversität in Hagen, Germany

Jens M. Schmidt*
Institute of Mathematics
TU Ilmenau, Germany

Abstract

Canonical orderings and their relatives such as st-numberings have been used as a key tool in algorithmic graph theory for the last decades. Recently, a unifying concept behind all these orders has been shown: they can be described by a graph decomposition into parts that have a prescribed vertex-connectivity.

Despite extensive interest in canonical orderings, no analogue of this unifying concept is known for edge-connectivity. In this paper, we establish such a concept named *edge-orders* and show how to compute *(1,1)-edge-orders* of 2-edge-connected graphs as well as *(2,1)-edge-orders* of 3-edge-connected graphs in linear time, respectively. While the former can be seen as the edge-variants of *st-numberings*, the latter are the edge-variants of *Mondshein sequences* and *non-separating ear decompositions*. The methods that we use for obtaining such edge-orders differ considerably in almost all details from the ones used for their vertex-counterparts, as different graph-theoretic constructions are used in the inductive proof and standard reductions from edge- to vertex-connectivity are bound to fail.

As a first application, we consider the famous *Edge-Independent Spanning Tree Conjecture*, which asserts that every k-edge-connected graph contains k rooted spanning trees that are pairwise edge-independent. We illustrate the impact of the above edge-orders by deducing algorithms that construct 2- and 3-edge independent spanning trees of 2- and 3-edge-connected graphs, the latter of which improves the best known running time from $O(n^2)$ to linear time.

1 Introduction

Canonical orderings serve as a fundamental tool in various fields of algorithmic graph theory, see [2, 27] for a wealth of over 30 applications. Under this name, canonical orderings were published 1988 for maximal planar graphs [8] and soon after generalized to 3-connected planar graphs [16]. Interestingly, it turned out only recently [27] that different research communities did, independently and partly even earlier, invent a strict generalization of canonical orderings to arbitrary 3-connected graphs under the names *(2,1)-sequences* [21] (anticipating many of their later planar features in 1971) and *non-separating ear decompositions* [6].

In particular, [27] exhibits a unifying view on all these different phrasings: In essence, a canonical ordering of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a total order on V such that for (almost) all i, the first i vertices induce a 2-connected graph and the remaining vertices induce a connected graph in G. The "heart" of canonical orderings is thus *connectivity*, with all of its implications for planarity, and not *planarity* itself. For this reason, Mondshein called these orders (2,1)-sequences. In accordance with Biedl and Derka [4], we therefore propose the general concept of (k, l)-*orders*, which are total orders on V whose prefixes induce k-connected and whose suffixes induce l-connected graphs.

*This research was supported by the DFG grant SCHM 3186/1-1.

Several relatives of canonical orderings aka (2,1)-orders fit into this context: The well-known *st-numberings* and *-orientations* are actually (1,1)-orders of 2-connected graphs, *chain decompositions* are (2,2)-orders of 4-connected graphs, and further orders on restricted graph classes such as planar graphs and triangulations are known (see Table 1 left).

$k\backslash l$	1	2
1	*st*-numbering [10] $O(m)$	
2	Mondshein sequence [27] $O(m)$	Chain decomposition [7] $O(n^2m)$, if planar: [23] $O(m)$
3	(3,1)-order [4] for triangulations $O(m)$	5-canonical decomposition [22] for triangulations $O(m)$
4		

$k\backslash l$	1	2
1	*st*-edge-numbering [1] $O(m)$ *(+in this paper)*	
2	(2,1)-edge-order $O(m)$ *(in this paper)*	
3		
4		

Table 1: Known (k, l)-orders for $(k+l)$-connected graphs along with the best-known running times for constructing them (*left*), and (k, l)-edge-orders for $(k + l)$-edge-connected graphs (*right*).

The purpose of this paper is to extent this unifying view further to (k, l)-*edge-orders*, in which prefixes are k-edge-connected and suffixes are l-edge-connected. Despite the many known and heavily used vertex-orders above, their natural edge-variants do not seem to be well-studied. In fact, we are only aware of one technical report by Annexstein et al. [1], which deals with (1,1)-edge-orders (under the name *st-edge-orderings*). Besides this classification, we present a simple description how a (1,1)-edge-order can be computed. Our main contribution is then an algorithm that computes a (2,1)-edge-order of a 3-edge-connected graph in time $O(m)$ (see Table 1 right), of which the corresponding result for the vertex-counterpart took over 40 years.

From a top-level perspective, this latter result follows closely the proof outline used for its vertex-counterpart in [27]. However, each part of this proof requires new ideas and non-trivial formalizations: BG-sequences differ from Mader-sequences (and, although not too far apart, it took a 28-page paper to show that the latter can be computed in linear time as well [20]), both non-separateness and $\overline{G_i}$ differ considerably already in their definitions, and, here, we need last-values in addition to just birth-values.

Just like (2,1)-orders, which immediately led to improvements on the best-known running time for 5 applications [27, 5], (2,1)-edge-orders seem to be an important and useful tool for many graph algorithms. We give one application, which is related to the edge-independent spanning tree conjecture [15] (further are in progress): By using a (2,1)-edge-order, we show how three edge-independent spanning trees of 3-edge-connected graphs can be computed in time $O(m)$, improving the best-known running time $O(n^2)$ by Gopalan et al. [13].

After giving preliminary facts on ear decompositions, we explain the proposed linear-time algorithms for computing (1,1)- and (2,1)-edge-orders in Sections 3–5. Section 6 then shows algorithms for computing two and three edge-independent spanning trees.

2 Preliminaries

We use standard graph-theoretic terminology and consider only graphs that are finite and undirected, but may contain parallel edges and self-loops. In particular, cycles may have length one or two. For $k \geq 1$, let a graph G be *k-edge-connected* if $n := |V| \geq 2$ and G has no edge-cut of size less than k.

Definition 1 ([17, 28])**.** An *ear decomposition* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a sequence $(P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_k)$ of subgraphs of G that partition E such that (i) P_0 is a cycle that is no self-loop and (ii) every P_i,

$1 \leq i \leq k$, is either a path that intersects $P_0 \cup \cdots \cup P_{i-1}$ in its endpoints or a cycle that intersects $P_0 \cup \cdots \cup P_{i-1}$ in a unique vertex q_i (which we call *endpoint* as well). Each P_i is called an *ear*. An ear is *short* if it is an edge and *long* otherwise.

Theorem 2 ([24])**.** *A graph is 2-edge-connected if and only if it has an ear decomposition.*

According to Whitney [28], every ear decomposition has exactly $m-n+1$ ears ($m := |E|$). For any i, let $G_i = (V_i, E_i) := P_0 \cup \cdots \cup P_i$ and $\overline{E_i} := E - E_i$. We denote the subgraph of G that is induced by $\overline{E_i}$ as $\overline{G_i} = (\overline{V_i}, \overline{E_i})$. Clearly, $\overline{G_j} \subset \overline{G_i}$ for every $i < j$. We note that this definition of $\overline{G_i}$ differs from the definition $\overline{G_i} := G - V_i$ that was used for (2,1)-vertex-orders [27], due to the weaker edge-connectivity assumption.

For any ear P_i, let $inner(P_i) := V(P_i) - G_{i-1}$ be the set of *inner vertices* of P_i (for P_0, every vertex is an inner vertex). Hence, for a cycle $P_i \neq P_0$, $inner(P_i) = V(P_i) - q_i$. Every vertex of G is an inner vertex of exactly one long ear, which implies that, in an ear decomposition, the inner vertex sets of the long ears partition V.

Definition 3. Let $D = (P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_{m-n})$ be an ear decomposition of G. For an edge e, let $birth_D(e)$ be the index i such that P_i contains e. For a vertex v, let $birth_D(v)$ be the index i such that P_i contains v as inner vertex and let $last_D(v)$ be the maximal index $birth(vw)$ over all neighbors w of v. Whenever D is clear from the context, we will omit the subscript D.

Thus, $P_{last(v)}$ is the last ear that contains v and, seen from another perspective, the first ear P_i such that $\overline{G_i}$ does not contain v. Clearly, a vertex v is contained in $\overline{G_i}$ if and only if $last(v) > i$.

3 The (1,1)-edge-order

Although (1,1)-edge-orders can be seen as edge-counterparts of *st*-numberings, they do not seem to be well-known. Let two edges be *neighbors* if they share a common vertex. Annexstein et al. gave essentially the following definition.

Definition 4 ([1])**.** Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with an edge st that is not a self-loop. A *(1,1)-edge-order through st* of G is a total order $<$ on the edge set $E - st$ such that $m \geq 2$,
- every edge e that is not incident to s has a neighbor e' with $e' < e$ and
- every edge e that is not incident to t has a neighbor e' with $e < e'$.

Clearly, if G has a (1,1)-edge-order through st, G is 2-edge-connected, as neither st nor any other edge can be a bridge of G (note that this requires $m \geq 2$).

The converse statement was shown in [1] using a special type of ear decompositions based on breadth-first-search (however, without giving details of the linear-time algorithm). Here, we aim for a simple and direct (unlike, e.g., reducing to (1,1)-orders via line-graphs) exposition of the underlying idea and show that *any* ear decomposition can be transformed to a (1,1)-edge-order in linear time.

For convenience, we use the *incremental list order-maintenance problem*, which maintains a total order subject to the operations of (i) *inserting* an element after a given element and (ii) *comparing* two distinct given elements by returning the one that is smaller in the order. Bender et al. [3] show a simple solution for an even more general problem with amortized constant time per operation; we will call this the *order data structure*.

Lemma 5. *Let G be a 2-edge-connected graph with an edge st that is not a self-loop. Then a (1,1)-edge-order through st can be computed in time $O(m)$.*

Proof. We compute an ear decomposition D of G such that $st \in P_0$. This can be done in linear time by any text-book-algorithm; see [26] for a simple one. Let $<_0$ be the total order that orders the edges in $P_0 - st$ consecutively from s to t. Clearly, $<_0$ is a (1,1)-edge-order through st of the 2-edge-connected graph G_0. We extend $<_{i-1}$ iteratively to a (1,1)-edge-order $<_i$ of G_i by adding the next ear P_i of D; then $<_{m-n}$ gives the claim.

The order itself is stored in the *order data structure*. For every vertex x in G_{i-1}, let $min(x)$ be the smaller of its two incident edges in $P_{birth(x)}$ with respect to $<_{i-1}$ (for later arguments, define $max(x)$ analogously as the larger such edge); clearly, $min(x)$ and $max(x)$ can be computed in constant time while adding P_j. When adding the ear P_i with (not necessarily distinct endpoints) x and y, let e be the smallest edge in $\{min(x), min(y)\}$ with respect to $<_{i-1}$ (this needs amortized constant time by using at most one comparison of the data structure). Consider all edges of P_i in consecutive order starting with a neighbor of e. We obtain $<_i$ from $<_{i-1}$ by inserting these edges as one consecutive block immediately after the edge e; this takes amortized time proportional to the length of P_i. Then the first edge of P_i has a smaller neighbor in $<_i$ while the last has a larger neighbor in $<_i$ (for cycles $P_i \neq P_0$, this exploits that q_i has another incident edge in G_{i-1}), which implies that $<_i$ is a (1,1)-edge-order. □

This (special) (1,1)-edge-order will allow for a very easy computation of two edge-independent spanning trees in Section 6 and serve as a building block for the computation of three such trees. If one wants to keep the root-paths in two edge-independent spanning trees short, a different (1,1)-edge-order [1] may be computed by maintaining $min(x)$ as the incident edge of x that is minimal in G_i in the above algorithm (this can be done efficiently by updating $min(x)$ whenever an ear with endpoint x is added). However, the latter order cannot be used for three edge-independent spanning trees.

4 The (2,1)-edge-order

We define (2,1)-orders as special ear decompositions.

Definition 6. Let G be a graph with distinct edges rt and ru ($t = u$ is possible). A *(2,1)-edge-order* through rt and avoiding ru (see Figure 1) is an ear decomposition D of G such that

1. $rt \in P_0$,
2. $P_{m-n} = ru$, and ▷ i.e., the last ear is the short ear ru
3. for every $0 \leq i < m-n$, $\overline{G_i}$ contains $inner(P_i)$ and, if P_i is short, at least one endpoint of P_i.



Figure 1: A (2,1)-edge order of a 3-edge connected graph.

Definition 6.2 implies that $\overline{G_i}$ contains the vertices r and u for every $0 \leq i < m-n$. We call Definition 6.3 the *non-separateness* of D. The non-separateness of D states that every inner vertex of a long ear P_i has an incident edge in G that is in $\overline{G_i}$, and that every short ear P_i (seen as edge) has a neighbor in $\overline{G_i}$. The name refers to the following helpful property.

Lemma 7. *Let D be a (2,1)-edge-order. Then, for every $0 \leq i < m - n$, $\overline{G_i}$ is connected.*

Proof. Consider any $i < m - n$ and let e be any edge in $\overline{G_i}$. By Definition 6.2, $r \in \overline{G_i}$. We show that $\overline{G_i}$ contains a path from one of the endpoints of e to r. This gives the claim, as $\overline{G_i}$ is an edge-induced graph and therefore does not contain isolated vertices.

Let P_j be the unique ear that contains e. If P_j is short, $P_j = e$ and e has a neighbor in $\overline{G_j}$ due to the non-separateness of D. If P_j is long, at least one endpoint of e must be an inner vertex of P_j and e has a neighbor in $\overline{G_j}$ for the same reason. Hence, in both cases we find a neighbor that is contained in an ear P_k with $k > j$. By applying induction on the indices of these ears, we find a path that starts with an endpoint of e and ends with the only edge left in $\overline{G_{m-n-1}}$, namely ru. □

Next, we show that the existence of a (2,1)-edge-order proves the graph to be 3-edge-connected.

Lemma 8. *If G has a (2,1)-edge-order, G is 3-edge-connected.*

Proof. Let D be a (2,1)-edge-order through rt and avoiding ru. Consider any vertex v of G. By transitivity of edge-connectivity, it suffices to show that G contains three edge-disjoint paths between v and r. Let P_i be the ear that contains v as inner vertex. In particular $i < m - n$, as P_i is long. Then G_i has an ear decomposition and, due to Theorem 2, contains two edge-disjoint paths between v and r. By Definitions 6.2+3, $\overline{G_i}$ contains v and r. According to Lemma 7, $\overline{G_i}$ is connected. Thus, $\overline{G_i}$ contains a third path between v and r, which is edge-disjoint from the first two, as G_i and $\overline{G_i}$ are edge-disjoint. □

Let G have a (2,1)-edge-order. Then Lemma 8 implies $\delta(G) \geq 3$. This in turn gives that, for every vertex v, $P_{last(v)}$ is not the first ear that contains v, which implies that $P_{last(v)}$ must have v as endpoint. In particular, if vw is an edge and $last(v) = last(w) = birth(vw)$, $P_{birth(vw)}$ is the short ear vw and, according to the non-separateness of D, we have $i = m - n$, which implies $vw = ru$.

Lemma 9. *For any vertex v, $P_{last(v)}$ has v as an endpoint. For any edge vw satisfying $last(v) = last(w) = birth(vw)$, $vw = ru$.*

The converse of Lemma 8 is also true: If G is 3-edge-connected, G has a (2,1)-edge-order. This gives a full characterization of 3-edge-connected graphs; however, proving the latter direction is more involved than Lemma 8. In the next section, we will prove the stronger statement that such a (2,1)-edge-order does not only exist but can actually be computed efficiently.

5 Computing a (2,1)-edge-order

At the heart of our algorithm is the following classical construction of 3-edge-connected graphs due to Mader.

Definition 10. The following operations on graphs are called *Mader-operations* (see Figure 2).

(a) *vertex-vertex-addition*: Add an edge between the not necessarily distinct vertices v and w (possibly a parallel edge or, if $v = w$, a self-loop).

(b) *edge-vertex-addition*: Subdivide an edge ab with a vertex v and add the edge vw for a vertex w.

(c) *edge-edge-addition*: Subdivide two distinct edges ab and cd with vertices v and w, respectively, and add the edge vw.

The edge vw is called the *added edge* of the Mader-operation. Let K_2^3 be the graph that consists of exactly two vertices and three parallel edges.



(a) vertex-vertex-addition: $v = w$ is allowed.

(b) edge-vertex-addition: $w \in \{a, b\}$ is allowed.

(c) edge-edge-addition: $a, b \in \{c, d\}$ is allowed.

Figure 2: Mader-operations

Theorem 11 ([18]). *A graph G is 3-edge-connected if and only if G can be constructed from K_2^3 using Mader-operations.*

According to Theorem 11, applying Mader-operations on 3-edge-connected graphs preserves 3-edge-connectivity. We will call a sequence of Mader-operations that constructs a 3-edge-connected graph a *Mader-sequence*. It has been shown that a Mader-sequence can be computed efficiently.

Theorem 12 ([20, Thm. 4]). *A Mader-sequence of a 3-edge-connected graph can be computed in time $O(n + m)$.*

Our algorithm for computing a (2,1)-edge-order works as follows. Assume we want a (2,1)-edge-order of G through $r\bar{t}$ and avoiding $r\bar{u}$. We first compute a suitable Mader-sequence of G using Theorem 12 and start with a (2,1)-edge-order of its first graph K_2^3. This can be easily found (see Figure 3). The crucial part of the algorithm is then to iteratively modify the given (2,1)-edge-order to a (2,1)-edge-order of the next graph in the sequence efficiently.



Figure 3: A (2,1)-edge-order of K_2^3 through rt and avoiding ru.

There are several technical difficulties to master. First, the edges $r\bar{t}$ and $r\bar{u}$ may change during the Mader-sequence, as they may be subdivided by Mader-operations. We therefore use a special Mader-sequence to harness the dynamics of the vertices r, $\bar{t}$ and $\bar{u}$. We choose a DFS-tree of G with root r and fix the edges $r\bar{t}$ and $r\bar{u}$. This way the initial K_2^3 will contain r as one of its two vertices and, by the construction of [20, p. 6], r will never be relabeled. Although $\bar{t}$ and $\bar{u}$ may not be present in this initial K_2^3, the bijection between the graphs H of the Mader-sequence and H-subdivisions that are contained in G as subgraphs [20, Thm.+Cor. 1] (we refer to [25, Section 2.3] for details of this bijection) gives us good replacement vertices t and u in K_2^3 for $\bar{t}$ and $\bar{u}$: If we, for every subdivision the Mader-sequence does on rt or ru, respectively, label the subdividing vertex with t or u (the old t or u is then relabeled), the vertices labeled t and u at the end of the Mader-sequence will be $\bar{t}$ and $\bar{u}$. Thus, we can assume that the final (2,1)-edge-order is indeed through $r\bar{t}$ and avoids $r\bar{u}$, as desired. We refer to [25, Section 4] for details on how to efficiently compute such a labeling scheme.

Now consider a graph G of the above Mader-sequence for which we know a (2,1)-edge-order D and let G' be the next graph in that sequence. Then G' is only one Mader-operation away and we aim for an efficient modification of D into a (2,1)-edge-order D' of G'. We will prove that there is

always a modification that is local in the sense that the only ears that are modified are "near" the added edge of the Mader-operation.

Lemma 13. *Let $D = (P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{m-n})$ be a (2,1)-edge-order of a 3-edge-connected graph G through rt and avoiding ru. Let G' be obtained from G by applying one Mader-operation Γ and let rt' and ru' be the edges of G' that correspond to rt and ru in G (as discussed above). Then a (2,1)-edge-order D' of G' through rt' avoiding ru' can be computed from D using only constantly many amortized constant-time modifications.*

Lemma 13 is our main technical contribution and we split its proof into the following three sections. First, we introduce the operations *leg*, *belly* and *head* in order to combine several cases that can be handled similarly for the different types of Γ. Second, we show how to modify D to D' and, third, we discuss computational issues.

For all three sections, let vw be the added edge of Γ such that v subdivides the edge $ab \in E(G)$ and w subdivides $cd \in E(G)$ (if applicable). Thus, the vertex t' in G' is either t, v or w, and the vertex u' in G' is either u, v or w (hence, $t'r$ and ru' will never be self-loops). In all three sections, *birth* and *last* will always refer to D, unless stated otherwise.

Let $P_i \neq P_0$ be an ear with a given orientation and let x be a vertex in P_i. If P_i is a path, we define $P_i[, x]$ and $P_i[x,]$ as the *maximal subpaths* of P_i that end and start at x, respectively; if P_i is a cycle, we take the same definition with the additional restriction that $P_i[, x]$ starts at q_i and $P_i[x,]$ ends at q_i. Occasionally, the orientation of P_i will not matter; if none is given, an arbitrary orientation can be taken. For paths A and B, let $A + B$ be the *concatenation* of A and B.

5.1 Legs, bellies and heads

While the operations *leg* and *belly* are inspired by the ones in [27], the operation *head* is new. All three operations will show for some special cases how D can be modified to a (2,1)-edge-order D'. A complete description for all cases (using these operations) will be given in the next section.

Legs. Let Γ be either an edge-vertex-addition such that $last(w) < birth(ab)$ or an edge-edge-addition such that $birth(cd) < birth(ab)$.

If $P_{birth(ab)}$ is long, at least one of a and b is an inner vertex, say w.l.o.g. b. Otherwise, $P_{birth(ab)} = ab$ is short and, as D is non-separating, at least one of a and b, say w.l.o.g. b, has an incident edge in $\overline{G_{birth(ab)}}$. In both cases, orient $P_{birth(ab)}$ from a to b. The operation *leg* constructs D' from D by replacing the ear $P_{birth(ab)}$ of D by the two consecutive ears $P_{birth(ab)}[, a] + av + vw$ and $vb + P_{birth(ab)}[b,]$ in that order and, if Γ is an edge-edge-addition, additionally subdividing the edge cd in $P_{birth(cd)}$ with w (see Figure 4). Note that this definition is well-defined also for cycles $P_{birth(ab)}$, including self-loops.



Figure 4: The result of operation *leg* (dashed lines), black vertices are in $G_{birth(ab)-1}$.

We prove that D' is a (2,1)-edge-order through rt' avoiding ru'. Assume first that Γ is an edge-vertex-addition. Since $last(w) < birth(ab)$, we conclude that $w \notin P_{birth(ab)}$ (w has no incident edge "left" in $\overline{G_{birth(ab)-1}}$). For the same reason, $birth(ab) > 0$. Hence, no matter whether $P_{birth(ab)}$ is a path or a cycle, w and the one or two endpoints of $P_{birth(ab)}$ are contained in $G_{birth(ab)-1}$. Since

D' partitions $E(G')$, this implies that D' is an ear decomposition. If Γ is an edge-edge-addition, $birth(cd) \leq birth(ab)$ gives a very similar argument.

It remains to prove that D' satisfies Properties 6.1–3. The first is true, as $rt \in P_0$ is only affected when $birth(cd) = 0$ and when rt is subdivided by w; then $w = t'$ in G' and $rt' \in P'_0$, as claimed. The second is true, as $cd \neq ru$ and, by assumption, $ab \neq ru$; hence, the last ear ru does not change. For the non-separateness of D', it suffices to consider the two modified ears $P_{birth(cd)}$ and $P_{birth(ab)}$, as all other ears still satisfy non-separateness. Since the only new inner vertex w in $P'_{birth(cd)}$ is incident to the edge $wv \in \overline{G'_{birth(cd)}}$, $P'_{birth(cd)}$ is also non-separating. It remains to consider the two new ears $P'_{birth(ab)} = P_{birth(ab)}[,a] + av + vw$ and $P'_{birth(ab)+1} = vb + P_{birth(ab)}[b,]$. All inner vertices of these ears except for the new vertex v inherit their non-separateness directly from $P_{birth(ab)}$. Since v is incident to vb, the long ear $P'_{birth(ab)}$ is non-separating and, if $P'_{birth(ab)+1}$ is long, $P'_{birth(ab)+1}$ is non-separating as well. If otherwise $P'_{birth(ab)+1} = vb$ is short, $P_{birth(ab)}$ cannot be long due to our assumed orientation. Hence, $P_{birth(ab)} = ab$ and the assumed orientation implies that b has an incident edge in $\overline{G_{birth(ab)}}$, which gives that $P'_{birth(ab)+1}$ is non-separating as well.

Bellies. Let Γ be either an edge-vertex-addition such that $last(w) = birth(ab)$ and $w \notin \{a, b\}$ or an edge-edge-addition such that $birth(cd) = birth(ab)$ (note that $c, d \in \{a, b\}$ is allowed.) Consider the shortest path in $P_{birth(ab)}$ from an endpoint to one of the vertices $\{a, b\}$, say w.l.o.g. b, such that w is contained in this path. We orient $P_{birth(ab)}$ from a to b. $P_{birth(ab)}$ is a long ear with b as inner vertex. If Γ is an edge-edge-addition, one of the vertices $\{c, d\}$, say w.l.o.g. c, is contained in $P_{birth(ab)}[, w]$.

If $birth(ab) > 0$, the operation *belly* constructs D' from D by replacing the ear $P_{birth(ab)}$ of D by the two consecutive ears $P_{birth(ab)}[, a] + av + vw + P_{birth(ab)}[w,]$ and $vb + P_{birth(ab)}[b, w]$ in that order (if edge-vertex-addition) and by the two consecutive ears $P_{birth(ab)}[, a] + av + vw + wd + P_{birth(ab)}[d,]$ and $vb + P_{birth(ab)}[b, c] + cw$ (if edge-edge-addition), see Figure 5. Note that this definition is well-defined also if $P_{birth(ab)}$ is a cycle. If $birth(ab) = 0$, the vertices v and w cut P_0 in two distinct paths $P_{0,1}$ and $P_{0,2}$ having endpoints v and w. Let $P_{0,1}$ be the path containing r. Then the operation *belly* constructs D' from D by replacing the ear $P_{birth(ab)}$ of D by the two consecutive ears $P_{0,1} + vw$ and $P_{0,2}$ in this order. If $rt \in \{ab, cd\}$, then either $v = t'$ or $w = t'$, respectively.

Figure 5: The result of the operation *belly* (dashed lines).

We prove that D' is a (2,1)-edge-order through rt' avoiding ru'. No matter whether $P_{birth(ab)}$ is a path or a cycle, the one or two endpoints of it are contained in $G_{birth(ab)-1}$ and D' partitions $E(G')$, so clearly D' is an ear decomposition.

It remains to prove that D' satisfies Properties 6.1–3. The first is true, as $rt \in P_0$ is only affected when $birth(ab) = 0$. Then, if rt is subdivided by v or w, $v = t'$ or $w = t'$ in G', and $rt' \in P'_0$, as claimed. The second is true, as $ru \notin \{ab, cd\}$ ($P_{birth(ab)} \neq \{ru\}$ as it is a long ear and $birth(cd) = birth(ab)$); hence, the last ear ru does not change. For the non-separateness of D', it again suffices to consider the modified ear $P_{birth(ab)}$. First, assume $birth(ab) > 0$. Consider the two new ears $P'_{birth(ab)} = P_{birth(ab)}[, a] + av + vw + P_{birth(ab)}[w,]$ (respectively, $P'_{birth(ab)} = P_{birth(ab)}[, a] + av + vw + wd + P_{birth(ab)}[d,]$ if edge-edge-addition) and $P'_{birth(ab)+1} = vb + P_{birth(ab)}[b, w]$ (respectively, $P'_{birth(ab)+1} = vb + P_{birth(ab)}[b, c] + cw$ if edge-vertex-addition). All inner vertices of

these ears except for the new vertex v (and w, if edge-edge-addition) inherit their non-separateness directly from $P_{birth(ab)}$. Since v is incident to vb (and w is incident to wc, if edge-edge-addition), the long ear $P'_{birth(ab)}$ is non-separating and $P'_{birth(ab)+1}$, which is long as it contains b as inner vertex, is non-separating as well. If $birth(ab) = 0$, very similar arguments show the non-separateness of the new ears.

Heads. Let Γ be an edge-vertex-addition such that $w \in \{a, b\}$, say w.l.o.g. $w = a$, and $last(a) = birth(ab)$ and, if $ab = ru$, then $r \neq a$. Then a is an endpoint of $P_{birth(ab)}$ ($P_{birth(ab)}$ cannot be a self-loop, as $last(a) = birth(ab)$). We orient $P_{birth(ab)}$ from a to b. The operation *head* constructs D' from D by replacing the ear $P_{birth(ab)}$ of D by the two consecutive ears $av + va$ and $vb + P_{birth(ab)}[b,]$ in that order (see Figure 6). Note that this definition is well-defined also for cycles $P_{birth(ab)}$.



Figure 6: The dashed lines show the result of the operation *head*.

We prove that D' is a (2,1)-edge-order through rt' avoiding ru'. Clearly, D' is an ear decomposition. Property 6.1 is true, as $birth(ab) = last(a) > 0$ and, hence, the first ear does not change. Property 6.2 is true, as the last ear is only affected when $birth(ab) = ru$ and $r \neq a$; then $v = u'$ in G' and the last ear in D' is ru', as claimed. For the non-separateness of D', we consider the two new ears $P'_{birth(ab)} = av + va$ and $P'_{birth(ab)+1} = vb + P_{birth(ab)}[b,]$. $P'_{birth(ab)}$ is a long ear with v as only inner vertex. Since v is incident to vb, $P'_{birth(ab)}$ is non-separating. All inner vertices of $P'_{birth(ab)+1}$ inherit their non-separateness directly from $P_{birth(ab)}$ and so, if $P'_{birth(ab)+1}$ is long, $P'_{birth(ab)+1}$ is non-separating as well. If otherwise $P'_{birth(ab)+1} = vb$ is short, then either $last(b) > last(a)$ and so b has an incident edge in $\overline{G_{birth(ab)}}$, which gives that $P'_{birth(ab)+1}$ is non-separating as well. If $last(b) = last(a)$ then $ab = ru$ (Lemma 9) and the ear $P'_{birth(ab)+1}$ is the last ear of D' and does not have to satisfy the non-separateness.

5.2 Modifying D to D'

We will now show how to obtain a (2,1)-edge-order D' through rt' avoiding ru' from D. By symmetry, assume w.l.o.g. that $birth(ab) \geq birth(cd)$. Note that applying the operations *belly*, *leg* and *head* preserves all properties of a $(2, 1)$-edge-order. Recall that, for every subdivision the Mader-sequences does on rt or ru, respectively, the subdividing vertex is t' or u', as explained after Figure 3. We have the following case distinctions:

1. Γ is a vertex-vertex-addition (see Figure 2a)

(a) vw is a self-loop at v ($v = w$): Obtain D' from D by adding the new short ear vv directly after the ear $P_{last(v)-1}$. This ensures that the new ear is non-separating.

(b) $v \neq w$ and $vw \neq \{rt, ru\}$: If $last(v) \leq last(w)$, D' is obtained from D by adding the new short ear vw directly after the ear $P_{last(w)-1}$, ensuring that the new ear is non-separating. If $last(v) > last(w)$, the new short ear vw is added directly after the ear $P_{last(v)-1}$.

(c) $vw = rt$ (the added edge is a parallel edge): the Mader-sequence gives us the information whether rt is rt' or the new added edge is rt'. If $rt = rt'$ then add the new edge immediately after the ear $P_{last(t)-1}$. Otherwise obtain D' from D by replacing rt with rt' in P_0 and adding the old edge rt as an short ear immediately after the ear $P_{last(t)-1}$.

(d) $vw = ru$ (the added edge is a parallel edge): the Mader-sequence gives us the information whether ru is ru' or the new added edge is ru'. Depending on this information, obtain

D' from D by either adding the new edge directly before or directly after the last ear of D.

2. Γ is an edge-vertex-addition (see Figure 2b)

(a) $birth(ab) < last(w)$: Obtain D' from D by adding the new short ear vw directly after the ear $P_{last(w)-1}$ and subdivide the ear $P_{birth(ab)}$ with v. This operation is also well-defined when $P_{birth(ab)}$ is a cycle or self-loop. Also, the new ear is non-separating and, since v is incident to w, the ear $P_{birth(ab)}$ remains non-separating.

(b) $last(w) < birth(ab)$ and $ab \neq ru$: Apply *leg*

(c) $birth(ab) = last(w)$ and $w \notin \{a, b\}$: Apply *belly*.

(d) $birth(ab) = last(w)$ and $w \in \{a, b\}$; if $ab = ru$, then $r \neq w$: Apply *head*.

(e) $ab = ru$ and if $birth(ab) = last(w)$ and $w \in \{a, b\}$ then $r = w$: Let $x \in \{a, b\}$ but $x \neq r$. Obtain D' from D by replacing the ear ru by the two consecutive ears $wv + vx$ and rv.

3. Γ is an edge-edge-addition (see Figure 2c)

(a) $birth(ab) = birth(cd)$: Apply *belly*.

(b) $birth(ab) > birth(cd)$ and $ab \neq ru$: Apply *leg*.

(c) $ab = ru$: Let w.l.o.g. $r = a$. Obtain D' from D by replacing the last ear of D by the two consecutive ears $bv + vw$ and rv in this order.

In all cases, D' is clearly an ear decomposition. Properties 6.1–3 are satisfied due to the given case distinction and the mentioned properties. Hence, D' is a $(2, 1)$-edge-order through rt' avoiding ru'.

5.3 Computational complexity

For proving Lemma 13, it remains to show that each of the constantly many modifications above can be computed in constant amortized time. Note that ears may become arbitrarily long in the process and therefore may contain up to $\Theta(n)$ vertices. Moreover, we have to maintain the birth- and last-values in order to compute which subcase of the last section applies. Thus, we cannot use the standard approach of storing the ears of D explicitly by using doubly-linked lists, as then the birth-values of linearly many vertices may change for every modification.

Instead, we will represent the ears as sets in a data structure for *set splitting*, which maintains disjoint sets online under an intermixed sequence of find and split operations. Gabow and Tarjan [11] discovered the first such data structure with linear space and constant amortized time per operation. Their and our model of computation is the standard unit-cost word-RAM. Imai and Asano [14] enhanced this data structure to an *incremental variant*, which additionally supports adding single elements to certain sets in constant amortized time. In both results, all sets are restricted to be intervals of some total order. To represent the (2,1)-edge-order D in the path replacement process, we will use the following more general data structure due to Djidjev [9, Section 3.2], which is not limited to total orders and still supports the add-operation.

The data structure maintains a collection P of edge-disjoint paths under the following operations:

`new_path(x,y)`: Creates a new path that consists of the edge xy. The edge xy must not be in any other path of P.

`find(e)`: Returns the integer-label of the path containing the edge e.

`split(xy)`: Splits the path containing the edge xy into the two subpaths from x to one endpoint and from x to the other endpoint of that path.

`sub(x,e)`: Modifies the path containing e by subdividing e with vertex x.

`replace(x,y,e)`: Neither x nor y may be an endpoint of the path Z containing e. Cuts Z into

the subpath from x to y and into the path that consists of the two remaining subpaths of Z joined by the new edge xy.

`add(x,yz)`: The vertex y must be an endpoint of the path Z containing the edge yz and x is either a new vertex or not in Z. Adds the new edge xy to Z.

Note that all ears are not only edge-disjoint but also internally disjoint. Djidjev proved that each of the above operations can be computed in constant amortized time [9, Theorem 1]. We will only represent long ears in the data structure; the remaining short ears can be simply maintained as edges. As the data structure can only store paths, we store every cycle P_i as the union of two paths in P_i of which one is an edge with endpoint q_i (for P_0, with endpoint r). For all paths of length at least two, including all long paths P_i, we store its two endpoints at its `find()`-label. Thus, the endpoints of all ears can be be accessed and updated in constant time.

This way, we store the ears of the initial (2,1)-edge-order of K_2^3 in constant total time. Every modification of Section 5.2 can then be realized with a constant number of operations of the data structure, and hence in amortized constant time.

Additionally, we need to maintain the order of the ears in D. Lemma 13 moves and inserts in every step only a constant number of ears to specified locations of D. Hence, we can maintain the order of ears in D by applying the *order data structure* (as defined for (1,1)-edge-oders) to the `find()`-labels of ears; this costs amortized constant time per step.

So far we could have maintained the order of ears also by using doubly-linked lists. However, for deciding which of the subcases in Section 5.2 applies, we additionally need to compare birth- and last-values of the vertices and edges involved in Γ. In fact, it suffices to support the queries "$birth(x) < birth(y)$" and "$birth(x) = birth(y)$", where x and y may be edges or vertices, and analogous queries on the *last*-values of vertices. If x and y are edges, both birth-queries can be computed in constant amortized time by comparing the labels `find(x)` and `find(y)` in the order data structure. In order to allow birth-queries on vertices, we will store pointers at every vertex x to the two edges e_1 and e_2 that are incident to x in $P_{birth(x)}$. The desired query involving $birth(x)$ can then be computed by comparing `find(`e_1`)` in the order data structure.

For any new vertex x that is added to D, we can find e_1 and e_2 in constant time, as these are in $\{av, vb, cw, wd, vw\}$. Since $P_{birth(x)}$ may change over time, we have to update e_1 and e_2. The only situation in which $P_{birth(x)}$ may loose e_1 or e_2 (but not both) is a `split` or `replace` operation on $P_{birth(x)}$ at x (the split operation must be followed by an add operation on x, as x is always inner vertex of some ear). This cuts $P_{birth(x)}$ into two paths, each of which contains exactly one edge in $\{e_1, e_2\}$. Checking `find(`e_1`)`=`find(`e_2`)` recognizes this case efficiently. Dependent on the particular case, we compute a new consistent pair $\{e_1', e_2'\}$ that differs from $\{e_1, e_2\}$ in exactly one edge. Finally, the value $last(x)$ for a vertex x can be maintained the same way as $birth(x)$ with the only difference that it links to (one edge of) the last ear containing x instead of the first such ear. This allows to check the desired comparisons in amortized constant time.

We conclude that D' can be computed from D in amortized constant time. This proves Lemma 13 and implies the following theorem.

Theorem 14. *Given edges tr and ru of a 3-edge-connected graph G, a (2,1)-edge-order D of G through tr and avoiding ru can be computed in time $O(m)$.*

The proposed algorithms for (1,1)-edge-orders and (2,1)-edge-orders (as well as the computation of edge-independent spanning trees in the next section) are *certifying* in the sense of [19]: For (1,1)-edge-orders through st, it suffices to check that every edge $e \neq st$ has indeed a smaller and larger neighboring edge. For (2,1)-edge-orders, it suffices to check in linear time that D is an ear decomposition of G and that D satisfies Definition 6.1–3.

6 Edge-Independent Spanning Trees

Let k spanning trees of a graph be *edge-independent* if they all have the same root vertex r and, for every vertex $x \neq r$, the paths from x to r in the k spanning trees are edge disjoint. The following conjecture was stated 1988 by Itai and Rodeh.

Conjecture (Edge-Independent Spanning Tree Conjecture [15])**.** Every k-edge-connected graph contains k edge-independent spanning trees.

The conjecture has been proven constructively for $k = 2$ [15] and $k = 3$ [13] with running times $O(m)$ and $O(n^2)$, respectively, for computing the corresponding edge-independent spanning trees. For every $k \geq 4$, the conjecture is open. We first give a short description of an algorithm for $k = 2$ and then show the first linear-time algorithm for $k = 3$.

For $k = 2$, compute the (1,1)-edge-order $<$ through tr using Lemma 5. The first tree T_1 consists of the edges $min(x)$ for all vertices $x \neq r$ (as defined in Lemma 5), while the second tree T_2 consists of tr and the edges $max(x)$ for all vertices $x \notin \{r, t\}$. Then T_1 and T_2 are spanning, as no edge can be taken twice, and edge-independent, as, from every vertex x, the path of smaller edges to r obtained by iteratively applying $min()$ must be edge-disjoint from the path of larger edges to r.

For $k = 3$, choose any vertex r and two distinct edges tr and ru in the 3-edge-connected graph G. Compute a (2,1)-edge-order D through tr and avoiding ru in time $O(m)$ using Theorem 14. For every vertex $x \in V$, the idea is now to find *two* edge-disjoint paths from x to r in $G_{birth(x)}$ (after all, $G_{birth(x)}$ is 2-edge-connected and thus contains a (1,1)-edge-order) and a *third* path from x to r in $\overline{G_{birth(x)}}$ using the non-separateness of D. The subtle part is to make this idea precise: We have to construct the first tree T_1 in such a consistent way that the paths of smaller edges from x to r for *all* vertices $x \in V$ are contained in T_1 (and the same for T_2 and paths of larger edges).

For a (1,1)-edge-order $<$ through tr of G, let a spanning tree $T_1 \subseteq G$ be *down-consistent* to a given (2,1)-edge-order through tr if (a) every path in T_1 to r is strictly decreasing in $<$ and (b) for every $0 \leq i \leq m - n$, $T_1 \cap G_i$ is a spanning tree of G_i (analogously, *up-consistent* spanning trees T_2 of $G - r$ are defined by strictly increasing paths to t). Now let a (1,1)-edge-order be *consistent* to a given (2,1)-edge-order D' if G contains r-rooted spanning trees T_1 and T_2 that are down- and up-consistent to D', respectively. By the very same argument as used for $k = 2$, T_1 and $T_2 + tr$ are edge-independent and, in addition, do not use any edge of $\overline{G_{birth(x)}}$ for any $x \in V$.

In fact, the special (1,1)-edge-order that is computed by Lemma 5 is consistent to D: There, the trees T_1 and T_2 consist of the edges $min(x)$ and $max(x)$ for $x \in V$, which makes T_1 down-consistent and $T_2 + tr$ up-consistent to D (see Figure 7a). We note that the simpler and more established definition of consistent (1,1)-edge-orders [6] as *orders that remain (1,1)-edge-orders for all subgraphs* G_i, $0 \leq i \leq m - n$, does not suffice here (see Figure 7b).

It remains to construct the third edge-independent spanning tree. For every edge $e \neq ru$ of G, we compute a pointer to an arbitrary neighboring edge e' in $\overline{G_{birth(e)}}$. This edge e' exists, as D is non-separating, and satisfies $birth(e') > birth(e)$. Similarly, for every vertex $x \in V - r - u$, we compute a pointer to an incident edge e' of x with $birth(e') > birth(x)$. Both computations take linear total time by comparing *birth* values. The third edge-independent spanning tree is then the union of ur and the u-rooted spanning tree of $G - r$ that interprets the pointers as parent edges. Hence, three edge-independent spanning trees can be computed in time $O(m)$.

Relation to vertex-independent spanning trees. The conjecture above has also received considerable attention for the vertex-case. Recently, a linear-time algorithm for computing three vertex-independent spanning trees of a 3-connected graph was given by [27]. One could be interested in the reason why, e.g., the reduction from k-edge- to k-vertex-connectivity by Galil and Italiano [12]



(a) A consistent order $<$ and the resulting three edge-independent spanning trees.



(b) Although $<$ is a (1,1)-edge-order for every G_i, $0 \leq i \leq m-n$, $<$ is not consistent: Any down-consistent tree contains the root-paths $12, 11, 10, 2$ in G_2 and $6, 5, 3, 2$ in G_5, which implies a cycle.

Figure 7: (1,1)-edge-orders that are consistent and not consistent to the (2,1)-edge-order of Figure 1.

cannot be applied to modify the 3-edge-connected input graph G to a 3-connected one such that three vertex-independent spanning trees for the latter give three edge-independent spanning trees in G. The reason is that, although such a reduction attempt is able to give three edge-disjoint paths between two given vertices, for multiple vertex pairs, the union of these paths may form cycles (see Figure 8).

That such a reduction could indeed be elusive, might also be argued by the fact that we still do not know any way of reducing the existence of edge-independent spanning trees to the existence of their vertex-counterpart. In fact, a proposed such reduction turned out to be wrong.

References

[1] F. Annexstein, K. Berman, and R. Swaminathan. Independent spanning trees with small stretch factors. Technical Report 96-13, DIMACS, June 1996.

[2] M. Badent, U. Brandes, and S. Cornelsen. More canonical ordering. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 15(1):97–126, 2011.

[3] M. A. Bender, R. Cole, E. D. Demaine, M. Farach-Colton, and J. Zito. Two simplified algorithms for maintaining order in a list. In *Proceedings of the 10th European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA'02)*, pages 152–164, 2002.

[4] T. Biedl and M. Derka. The (3,1)-ordering for 4-connected planar triangulations. (see arxiv.org/abs/1511.00873), November 2015.

[5] T. Biedl and J. M. Schmidt. Small-area orthogonal drawings of 3-connected graphs. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Symposium on Graph Drawing (GD'15)*, pages 153–165, 2015.

[6] J. Cheriyan and S. N. Maheshwari. Finding nonseparating induced cycles and independent spanning trees in 3-connected graphs. *Journal of Algorithms*, 9(4):507–537, 1988.

[7] S. Curran, O. Lee, and X. Yu. Chain decompositions of 4-connected graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 19(4):848–880, 2005.

[8] H. de Fraysseix, J. Pach, and R. Pollack. Small sets supporting fary embeddings of planar graphs. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC '88)*, pages 426–433, 1988.



(a) A 3-edge-connected graph G.



(b) The 3-connected graph $\hat{G}$ to which G is reduced to using [12], and a (2,1)-order of $\hat{G}$ through $r\hat{t}$ avoiding $\hat{u}$ (t and u have to be replaced, as $\hat{G}$ does not contain rt and ru anymore). Gray lines depict short ears.



(c) The three vertex-independent spanning trees T_1, T_2, T_3 of $\hat{G}$ implied by the (2,1)-order of $\hat{G}$.



(d) "Corresponding" subgraphs of T_1, T_2 and T_3 in G. The red subgraph contains a cycle.

Figure 8: The reduction [12] cannot be applied to find edge-independent spanning trees directly, as it may construct cycles.

[9] H. N. Djidjev. A linear-time algorithm for finding a maximal planar subgraph. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 20(2):444–462, 2006.

[10] S. Even and R. E. Tarjan. Computing an st-Numbering. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 2(3):339–344, 1976.

[11] H. N. Gabow and R. E. Tarjan. A linear-time algorithm for a special case of disjoint set union. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 30(2):209–221, 1985.

[12] Z. Galil and G. F. Italiano. Reducing edge connectivity to vertex connectivity. *SIGACT News*, 22(1):57–61, 1991.

[13] A. Gopalan and S. Ramasubramanian. On constructing three edge independent spanning trees. Manuscript (see citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.406.7119), March 2011.

[14] H. Imai and T. Asano. Dynamic orthogonal segment intersection search. *Journal of Algorithms*, 8(1):1–18, 1987.

[15] A. Itai and M. Rodeh. The multi-tree approach to reliability in distributed networks. *Information and Computation*, 79:43–59, 1988.

[16] G. Kant. Drawing planar graphs using the lmc-ordering. In *Proceedings of the 33th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'92)*, pages 101–110, 1992.

[17] L. Lovász. Computing ears and branchings in parallel. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'85)*, pages 464–467, 1985.

[18] W. Mader. A reduction method for edge-connectivity in graphs. In B. Bollobás, editor, *Advances in Graph Theory*, volume 3 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, pages 145–164. North-Holland, 1978.

[19] R. M. McConnell, K. Mehlhorn, S. Näher, and P. Schweitzer. Certifying algorithms. *Computer Science Review*, 5(2):119–161, 2011.

[20] K. Mehlhorn, A. Neumann, and J. M. Schmidt. Certifying 3-edge-connectivity. *Algorithmica*, to appear.

[21] L. F. Mondshein. *Combinatorial Ordering and the Geometric Embedding of Graphs*. PhD thesis, M.I.T. Lincoln Laboratory / Harvard University, 1971. Technical Report available at www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=AD0732882.

[22] S. Nagai and S. Nakano. A linear-time algorithm to find independent spanning trees in maximal planar graphs. In *26th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG'00)*, pages 290–301, 2000.

[23] S. Nakano, M. S. Rahman, and T. Nishizeki. A linear-time algorithm for four-partitioning four-connected planar graphs. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 62(6):315–322, 1997.

[24] H. E. Robbins. A theorem on graphs, with an application to a problem of traffic control. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 46(5):281–283, 1939.

[25] J. M. Schmidt. Construction sequences and certifying 3-connectedness. In *Proceedings of the 27th Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS'10)*, pages 633–644, 2010.

[26] J. M. Schmidt. A simple test on 2-vertex- and 2-edge-connectivity. *Information Processing Letters*, 113(7):241–244, 2013.

[27] J. M. Schmidt. The Mondshein sequence. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP'14)*, pages 967–978, 2014.

[28] H. Whitney. Non-separable and planar graphs. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 34(1):339–362, 1932.